

REMARKS

At the time of the Office Action dated April 16, 2007, claims 1-16 were pending and rejected in this application.

**CLAIMS 1-3, 5-11, 13, AND 15 ARE REJECTED UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103 FOR OBVIOUSNESS
BASED UPON HICKMAN ET AL., U.S. PATENT NO. 5,361,361 (HEREINAFTER HICKMAN), IN
VIEW OF LILLIE ET AL., U.S. PATENT PUBLICATION NO. 2005/0065913 (HEREINAFTER LILLIE)**

On pages 2-8 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserted that one having ordinary skill in the art would have arrived at the claimed invention based upon the combination of Hickman and Lillie. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In the third full paragraph on page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner admitted the following:

Hickman fails to disclose "interface units aggregated together into a single aggregated view", "help documents corresponding to said single aggregated view", and "rendering responsive to a request for help initiated in said single aggregated view".

Obviousness is a legal conclusion based on underlying facts of four general types, all of which must be considered by the trier of fact: (1) the scope and content of the prior art; (2) the level of ordinary skill in the art; (3) the differences between the claimed invention and the prior art; and (4) any objective indicia of nonobviousness.¹ Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has failed to properly characterize regarding (1) the scope and content of the prior art and (3) the

¹ See *KSR Int'l v. Teleflex Inc.*, 550 U.S. ____ (2007); *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 17-18 (1966); *Continental Can Co. USA, Inc. v. Monsanto Co.*, 948 F.2d 1264, 1270, 20 USPQ2d 1746, 1750-51 (Fed. Cir. 1991); *Panduit Corp. v. Dennison Mfg. Co.*, 810 F.2d 1561, 1566-68, 1 USPQ2d 1593, 1594 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

differences between the claimed invention and the prior art. In particular, Hickman fails to teach a composition of help documents corresponding to the single aggregated view and rendering the composition of help documents responsive to a request for help initiated in the single aggregated view.

In the fourth full paragraph on page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserted the following with regard to the teachings of Lillie:

However, Lillie discloses interface units aggregated together into a single aggregated view (Fig 5 and Paragraph 0054 lines 5-12: *four portlets are aggregated to one portal view*); help documents corresponding to said single aggregated view (Paragraph 0058: *Help files can be linked. It is inherent that these help files would correspond the portlets within the portal page*); and rendering help files responsive to request for help initiated in single aggregated view (Paragraph 0058: *input and output mechanisms can be employed for various communications. Help files can be linked for manual invocation*)

Finally, in the first full paragraph on page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner concluded the obviousness analysis as follows:

Lillie does not explicitly explain the operation of the help files associated with the portal page but does discuss the inclusion of such a feature. Since both Hickman and Lillie's field of endeavor deal with aggregating multiple computer content together, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Lillie and Hickman in order to create a single help file directory associated with an aggregate application like a portal. It would also be obvious to modify Hickman's invention to populate a list of installed applications present in the portal page rather than programs installed within the entire system.

At the outset, Applicants note that the Examiner has submitted a substantially flawed analysis. In rejecting a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 103, the Examiner is required to identify a source in the applied prior art for: (1) claim limitations; and (2) the motivation to combine references or modify a reference in the reasonable expectation of achieving a particular benefit.² The Examiner, however, has failed to establish that either Hickman or Lillie teach or suggest the claimed composition of help documents corresponding to the single aggregated view. Moreover, the Examiner has failed to

² *Smiths Industries Medical System v. Vital Signs Inc.*, 183 F.3d 1347, 51 USPQ2d 1415 (Fed. Cir. 1999).

establish what is the particular benefit that one having ordinary skill in the art would enjoy based upon this combination. Thus, the Examiner has identified a source in Lillie for neither the claimed composition of help documents corresponding to the single aggregated view nor a particular benefit associated with this modification.

As an aside, Applicants are unclear as the Examiner statement that "it would also be obvious to modify Hickman's invention to populate a list of installed applications present in the portal page rather than programs installed within the entire system." What is the "list of installed applications present in the portal page" being populated with?

Claims 3 and 13

Dependent claims 3 and 13 each recite, in part, the following limitations:

rendering both a view of said composition of help documents, and individual views of said separate help documents. (emphasis added)

To teach these limitations, the Examiner cited column 6, lines 64, 66, which state "[t]hus, the present invention integrates the display and selection of help directory information from multiple applications into a single window." The Examiner further stated the following:

The display of help information is performed by help viewer while the selection of help information is performed by the integrated help utility (bookcase). Both are present in a single window on the display system.

Applicants notes that the above assertion is not supported by the Examiner's cited passage within Hickman. Moreover, even if this assertion was supported, it does not teach or suggest the claimed limitations recited in claims 3 and 13. The claimed invention recites that at least three views are rendered: (i) the composition of help documents and (ii)/(iii) individual views (i.e., a plurality of views, which constitutes two or more views). Not only are these at least three views

not disclosed as being rendered by Hickman, Applicants are unclear as to which of the claimed views the alleged "selection of help information is performed by the integrated help utility" corresponds.

Claim 7

On page 7 of the Office Action, with regard to the claimed "help invoking logic coupled to said help system and disposed in said single aggregated view," the Examiner cited Column 7, lines 14-29 of Hickman. However, upon reviewing the Examiner's cited passage, Applicants are unclear where, specifically, Hickman teaches that the help invoking logic is disposed in the single aggregated view. With regard to the Examiner's obviousness analysis, Applicants incorporate herein, as also applying to claim 7, the arguments previously presented with regard to the Examiner's obviousness analysis as to claim 1 since the Examiner used the same analysis with claim 7 as the Examiner used with claim 1.

Applicants, therefore respectfully solicit withdrawal of the imposed rejection of claims 1,3, 5-11, 13, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 for obviousness based upon Hickman in view of Lillie.

**CLAIMS 2, 4, 12, AND 14 ARE REJECTED UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103 FOR OBVIOUSNESS
BASED UPON HICKMAN IN VIEW OF LILLIE AND PALANIAPPAN ET AL., U.S. PATENT
PUBLICATION NO. 2002/0054152 (HEREINAFTER PALANIAPPAN)**

On pages 9 and 10 of the Office Action, the Examiner concluded that one having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify Hickman in view of Lillie and Palaniappan to arrive at the claimed invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 2, 4 and 12, 14 respectively depend from independent claims 1 and 11, and Applicants incorporate herein the arguments previously advanced in traversing the imposed rejection of claims 1 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 for obviousness based upon Hickman in view of Lillie. The tertiary reference to Palaniappan does not cure the argued deficiencies of Hickman and Lillie. Accordingly, even if one having ordinary skill in the art were motivated to modify Hickman in view of Lillie and Palaniappan, the proposed combination of references would not yield the claimed invention. Applicants respectfully solicit withdrawal of the imposed rejection of claims 2, 4, 12, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 for obviousness based upon Hickman in view of Lillie and Palaniappan.

Applicants have made every effort to present claims which distinguish over the prior art, and it is believed that all claims are in condition for allowance. However, Applicants invite the Examiner to call the undersigned if it is believed that a telephonic interview would expedite the prosecution of the application to an allowance. Accordingly, and in view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants hereby respectfully request reconsideration and prompt allowance of the pending claims.

Although Applicants believe that all claims are in condition for allowance, the Examiner is directed to the following statement found in M.P.E.P. § 706(II):

When an application discloses patentable subject matter and it is apparent from the claims and the applicant's arguments that the claims are intended to be directed to such patentable subject matter, but the claims in their present form cannot be allowed because of defects in form or omission of a limitation, the examiner should not stop with a bare objection or rejection of the claims. The examiner's action should be constructive in nature and when possible should offer a definite suggestion for correction.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 09-0461, and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Date: July 16, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

/Scott D. Paul/

Scott D. Paul

Registration No. 42,984

Steven M. Greenberg

Registration No. 44,725

Phone: (561) 922-3845

CUSTOMER NUMBER 46320